WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

līme:_	8: 37 Weather Conditions:	<u>Su</u>	nny	4.4	
	-	Yes	No		Notes
CRL	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.8	: A			
1_	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	Ť	T		
	localized settlement observed on the	ļ:			-
•	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		1 1/	1,	
	CCR?	· .		ľ	
2	Were conditions observed within the cells				
	containing CCR or within the general landfill	1	1 1/	1	
	operations that represent a potential disruption				
	to ongoing CCR management operations?				
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or	i.			
	within the general landfill operations that	ŀ		1	
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			1	
	the CCR management operations.				
RFu	gitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)(4))			
4_	Was CCR received during the reporting		T T	Τ	
	period? If answer is no, no additional	. /		1 .	
	information required.				
5_	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust				
	suppresents) prior to delivery to landfill?		•		
6_	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR				
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to	ĺ		1	,
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not	./			
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?				
7_	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on				
	landfill access roads?		./		-
8_	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the				
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe	1		-	
	corrective action measures below.	.			-
9_	Are current CCR fugitive dust control				
	measures effective? If the answer is no.	. /			
	describe recommended changes below.				
.0_	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen				
ł	complaints received during the reporting	-			
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question	j	,		
I.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		-1/		<u> </u>
	T	ľ			

Q:\Waste Connections\Lansing\CCR Plan Final\Weekly Inspection Form 10_2015.xlsx

- WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

īme:_	Weather Conditions: - 5	y May	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	<u> </u>	
		Yes	No	1.	Notes
CRI	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.	: 349			
1_	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	· [
	localized settlement observed on the	=			
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing		1	1	
	CCR?				
2	Were conditions observed within the cells				
	containing CCR or within the general landfill			_	
	operations that represent a potential disruption	1			
	to ongoing CCR management operations?			_	
3_	Were conditions observed within the cells or	i.			
	within the general landfill operations that	ŀ		d	
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of			1	
	the CCR management operations.		1	ŀ	
RFc	ugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257-80(b)(<u>(4)</u>)	<u> </u>		
4_	Was CCR received during the reporting			1	
	period? If answer is no, no additional			1 .	
	information required.				
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust			 	
	suppresents) prior to delivery to landfill?		-		
6.	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR	··	·	 	
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to			l	
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not			1	
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?				
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on				
	landfill access roads?	İ		<u> </u>	•
8_	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the				
,	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe			-	
	corrective action measures below.	. 1			•
)_	Are current CCR fugitive dust control				
	measures effective? If the answer is no,				
	describe recommended changes below.				
) <u> </u>	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen				
	complaints received during the reporting				
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question		N		
	Were the citizen complaints logged?				
		1	1		

Q:\Waste Connections\Lansing\CCR Plan Final\Weekly Inspection Form 10_2015 xlsx

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Date:_	3-10-25 Inspector	AUA	har		
Time:	9:48 Weather Conditions: 5	unni	7	-	
	<u> </u>	Yes	No	1.	Notes
CCRI	Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257.	.84)			
1_	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	. [T	
1	localized settlement observed on the	F			
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	.	1	1'	
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells			 -	
}	containing CCR or within the general landfill		/		
1	operations that represent a potential disruption	1	i/		
	to ongoing CCR management operations?				
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or				
	within the general landfill operations that		1		
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of	€∤	\ \ \		
	the CCR management operations.				
CCRF	ugitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)	(4))			
4_	Was CCR received during the reporting	```	T	T	
	period? If answer is no, no additional		ļ		
	information required.				
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust		 		
	suppresents) prior to delivery to landfill?		-		
6_	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR	·			
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to				•
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not				
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?		i .		
7_	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on				
	landfill access roads?	[]			•
8_	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the				
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe		,/		
_	corrective action measures below.	.			•
9_	Are current CCR fugitive dust control				
	measures effective? If the answer is no,		- 1		
	describe recommended changes below.		1		
10_	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen				
	complaints received during the reporting	1			
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question	1	V		
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		1/		-
			V		
ldītional	Notes	. •			
	:				

Q:\Waste Connections\Lansing\CCR Plan Final\Weekly Inspection Form 10_2015 xls=

· WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

SKEVANSING LANDEUL

Date:	63-3-25 Inspector	flithy	LA			
Time	7:15 Weather Conditions: -C7	old	ovu	(ust		
		. Yes	No	1.	Notes	
CCR	Landfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.	.849				
1_	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or	. [1	<u> </u>	
	localized settlement observed on the	F				
-	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?		1	1		
- 2	Were conditions observed within the cells					
1	containing CCR or within the general landfill		ĺ	1		
	operations that represent a potential disruption	1		1		
	to ongoing CCR management operations?					
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or					
	within the general landfill operations that	F				
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of	=		7		
	the CCR management operations.					
CCRF	ngitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)	(<u>4</u>))	.1			_
4_	Was CCR received during the reporting			T		
	period? If answer is no, no additional		+	'		
	information required.	V				
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust					
	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?		-			
6_	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR		<u> </u>			
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to		1		•	
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not	. ,				
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?					
7_	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on					
	landfill access roads?				•	
8-	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the					
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe	. 1		-		
	corrective action measures below.		·		-	
9_	Are current CCR fugitive dust control					
	measures effective? If the answer is no,	-/	l			
	describe recommended changes below.					- 1
10_	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen					
	complaints received during the reporting	1				1
	period? If the answer is yes, answer question	1	L			- 1
11_	Were the citizen complaints logged?				-	\dashv
ldītional	Notes					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						—

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT SER LANSING LANDFILL

Date:_	7-23-25 Inspector	SUGAL			
Time:	12:45 Weather Conditions: -C	lowly	J C	old.	
		Yes	No	T.	Notes
CCRI	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR 5257.	84)			
1_	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or			- T	
1	localized settlement observed on the	F			
	sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?			1	
2	Were conditions observed within the cells				
	containing CCR or within the general landfill		V		
1	operations that represent a potential disruption	ı			
	to ongoing CCR management operations?				
3_	Were conditions observed within the cells or	į,			
	within the general landfill operations that	f '			
	represent a potential disruption of the safety of	₹		1	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	the CCR management operations.				,
	ngitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)	<u>(4))</u>			
4_	Was CCR received during the reporting				
	period? If answer is no, no additional			1	
	information required				
5.	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust				
	suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?		-		
6_	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR				
	conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to		1		•
	landfill working face, or was the CCR not			ļ	
	susceptable to fugitive dust generation?				
7 _	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on				
	landfill access roads?				•
8-	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the				
	landfill? If the answer is yes, describe			-	
	corrective action measures below.				•
9_	Are current CCR fugitive dust control				
	measures effective? If the answer is no,		ĺ		
	describe recommended changes below.				
10_	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen	-			
	complaints received during the reporting	1			
7.7	period? If the answer is yes, answer question	ļ			
11.	Were the citizen complaints logged?		V		<u> </u>
ldītional	Notes:				

WEEKLY COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUAL (CCR) INSPECTION REPORT

Date: 2-18-25	Inspector Inspector	COLAND:	FILL		-
Time: 8:45	Weather Conditions:	4,		-	
		Yes	No	•	Notes
CCR Landfill Integrity In	spection (per 40 CFR 5257.8	. ——— 49			

	<u> </u>	Yes	No	. Notes
CCRI	andfill Integrity Inspection (per 40 CFR \$257.	.8 <i>4</i> 9		
1-	Was bulging, sliding, rotational movement or localized settlement observed on the sideslopes or upper deck of cells containing CCR?	-		-
- 2.	Were conditions observed within the cells containing CCR or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption to ongoing CCR management operations?	1	V	
3.	Were conditions observed within the cells or within the general landfill operations that represent a potential disruption of the safety of the CCR management operations.	į.	V	
CCRF	igitive Dust Inspection (per 40 CFR §257.80(b)	(<u>4</u>))		
4.	Was CCR received during the reporting period? If answer is no, no additional information required.			
5_	Was all CCR conditioned (by wetting or dust suppresants) prior to delivery to landfill?	V	-	
6_	If response to question 5 is no, was CCR conditioned (wetted) prior to transport to landfill working face, or was the CCR not susceptable to fugitive dust generation?			
7.	Was CCR spillage observed at the scale or on landfill access roads?			·
8_	Was CCR fugitive dust observed at the landfill? If the answer is yes, describe corrective action measures below.		V	
9.	Are current CCR fugitive dust control measures effective? If the answer is no, describe recommended changes below.			-
10.	Were CCR fugitive dust-related citizen complaints received during the reporting period? If the answer is yes, answer question			
11_	Were the citizen complaints logged?			-
			~	1

	•
Additional Notes	. •
•	